

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/015,110	11/13/2001	Shozo Fukunaga	F-7223	6790	
28107	7590 11/04/2004		EXAMINER		
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP 122 EAST 42ND STREET			ONEILL, MICHAEL W		
SUITE 4000	IND STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK	, NY 10168		3713		

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					1
,		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)	(7/1
		10/015,1	10	FUKUNAGA ET AL.	V
0	ffice Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit	
		Michael		3713	
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this commun	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the	correspondence addre)SS
A SHORTE THE MAILI - Extensions o after SIX (6) - If the period f - If NO period f - Failure to rep Any reply rec	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD F NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN If time may be available under the provisions MONTHS from the mailing date of this common for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 for reply is specified above, the maximum striply within the set or extended period for reply eived by the Office later than three months to term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ending in the standard in t	vent, however, may a reply be tutory minimum of thirty (30) d. vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro plication to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this comm IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status				,	
1)⊠ Resp	onsive to communication(s) file	ed on 19 Auaust 200	4.		•
·		2b)☐ This action is			
3) Since	e this application is in conditioned in accordance with the pract	•			erits is
Disposition of	Claims				
4a) O 5)☐ Clain 6)☐ Clain 7)⊠ Clain	n(s) 6-21 is/are pending in the afthe above claim(s) is/ant(s) is/are allowed. n(s) is/are rejected. n(s) 6-21 is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from co			
Application Pa	apers				
9) <u></u> The s	pecification is objected to by th	e Examiner.			
10)∏ The d	rawing(s) filed on is/are	: a)□ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the	e Examiner.	
Applio	cant may not request that any obje	ction to the drawing(s)	be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
•	cement drawing sheet(s) including ath or declaration is objected t	•		•	•
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	• • • • •	documents have be documents have be of the priority docum anal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applica ents have been recei lle 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Sta	age
Amahaa ==4/=)					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of Re	eferences Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summa	rv (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Dr	aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F		Paper No(s)/Mail	Date	
	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or //Mail Date	PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Information Other:	Patent Application (PTO-1	52) ,

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6-14-04 has been entered.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114.

Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action

Art Unit: 3713

is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The rejection of claims 6-12 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Ishikawa further
in view of Masanobu is maintained and incorporated herein.

The rejection of claims 13-15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Ishikawa further in view of Masanobu further in view of Sakakawa is maintained and incorporated herein.

Applicant's arguments filed 6-14-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicants' contention that independent claim 6 is amended to clarify that the head positions of the game player which are measured in left and right directions, are measured relative to a fixed position of the monitor screen and the prior art references do not teach or suggest this feature,

Application/Control Number: 10/015,110

Art Unit: 3713

the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim now clearly reads that the head position of the game player are measured in the left and right directions and are measured relative to a fixed position of the monitor. Moreover, the prior art references disclose this aspect, see e.g. Oh col. 4:50-67.

In response to Applicants' contention that Ishikawa et al. can't be used with the other references because it is a head mounted unit, the Examiner has two salient points. First, the Applicants' embodiments uses a head mounted unit, see. e.g. figure 29, so the Examiner doesn't understand the impropriety of using a similar piece of art to the Applicants head mounted unit. Second, regarding the bodily incorporation issue that the Applicants seem to be raising in this contention, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to the Applicants' contention that the combination of references lacks in teaching and suggesting a

Application/Control Number: 10/015,110

Art Unit: 3713

game system in which a viewpoint of a virtual camera approximates a view seen by the game player, and in which interaction between the opponent character and the game player is based upon a relationship between the opponent character and the viewpoint position of the virtual camera, the Examiner responds with that what the Applicants are contenting in a number of words can be simply summed as the claimed game system presents the images on the display in a first person viewpoint. Oh discloses a third person viewpoint. Ishikawa et al. teaches using first person viewpoints in order to create realistic imagery; therefore, it would be obvious to combine for the reasoning suggested in Ishikawa et al.

In response to Applicants' argument that suggestions found in Sakakawa of markings won't work with the combination of Oh, Ishikawa and Masanobu because these markings are not on a "monitor", the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael O'Neill whose telephone number is 703-308-3484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on 703-308-2064. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MON

MICHAEL O'NEILL PRIMARY EXAMINER

muleny